

## **IX. APPENDICES**

### **A. CHARTER**

#### **BACKGROUND**

The Division of Wildlife Conservation (DWC) initiated a strategic planning effort in 1995 to identify and pursue needs, goals, and objectives associated with conserving Alaska's wildlife and serving the public. Efforts began with developing a Division PEER Group (a cross-section of staff appointed to 2-year terms to address internal issues and concerns) and a Division Management Team (DMT) (a 9-member group of regional, divisional, and program managers).

The PEER Group and DMT met jointly on two occasions during 1999 – 2000 to outline steps for developing the division's strategic plan. They agreed that the first step was to involve staff in developing vision, mission, guiding philosophy and values, and general goals for the division. This was accomplished at regional staff meetings held during December 1999 – January 2000. Elements identified and approved by staff will provide guidance for the division as additional strategic planning elements are developed.

To help the division identify and respond to the wide array of conservation needs and public interests, the PEER Group and DMT proposed developing staff work groups to consider needs, goals, and objectives associated with six subject areas. These areas, reviewed and discussed with DWC staff, include: (1) Administrative Support / Human Resources, (2) Education, (3) Existing Game Management & Research, (4) Nongame Management & Research, (5) Public Service, and (6) Watchable Wildlife.

Work groups appointed to each of these areas will consist of up to 10 staff members with knowledge and interest in the subject. Two DMT members will serve on each work group and non-division individuals (i.e., staff from other divisions) may be included following approval of the DMT. Each work group will be provided with a facilitator and recorder. The DMT will select two co-chairs from among each group's membership.

The DMT places high priority on the division's strategic planning effort and is committed to providing necessary resources to ensure its success. This charter outlines the charge and expectations for the *Public Service Work Group*.

#### **VISION, MISSION, GUIDING PHILOSOPHY AND VALUES, & GOALS**

The vision, mission, guiding philosophy and values, and goals noted below will help guide the efforts of this work group.

**Vision:** Excellence in wildlife conservation and public service.

**Mission:** Conserve and enhance Alaska's wildlife and habitats and provide for a wide range of public uses and benefits.

Guiding Philosophy and Values: **The Division of Wildlife Conservation recognizes wildlife as a public trust belonging to all Alaskans. We respect the diversity of public values associated with wildlife and support uses that reflect public support and sound principles of conservation. We are an organization of individuals committed to interacting professionally with one another and the public and to using scientific data and public input to conserve Alaska's wildlife.**

Goals:

- (1) **Extend and improve services, opportunities, and outreach to all wildlife users.**
- (2) **Maintain and enhance our high level of wildlife research and management expertise.**
- (3) **Improve our internal effectiveness and efficiency.**
- (4) **Promote public participation in decision-making.**
- (5) **Develop methods to deal with dual management of our wildlife resources and work for resumption of state management.**

## **GROUP IDENTITY**

The *Public Service Work Group* will function as a "task force." When its work is completed the group will be dissolved, although members may be asked to reconvene to evaluate the developed program in the future and recommend modifications as necessary.

## **PROBLEM**

Public service needs are diverse and numerous. However, DWC presently lacks knowledge of the full spectrum of these requirements and how to most effectively provide them. Furthermore, the division lacks an organized, targeted approach to maximize its limited resources to best provide public services.

## **CHARGE**

The charge to the *Public Service Work Group* is to identify and prioritize public service needs, define strategies for providing them (including service locations), and identify required human and monetary resources to provide them. The group should focus on internal perspectives and recommendations (i.e., within the department), but should also identify external sources for future input (i.e., public individuals or groups).

## **GENERAL GOAL**

Extend and improve services, opportunities, and outreach to all wildlife users.

## **OBJECTIVES**

- Identify and prioritize wildlife-related public services, as perceived internally.
- Identify external sources from whom to solicit future input.

- Identify numbers of personnel needed to provide public services along with recommendations on where these personnel should be located.
- Roughly estimate costs associated with providing public services.

## **ROLES AND EXPECTATIONS**

### **Members**

- Bring ideas and insights from staff to meetings for inclusion in discussions.
- Respect fellow group members and listen to their ideas and perspectives.
- Ensure the facilitator remains neutral and sticks strictly to meeting process.
- Ensure the recorder accurately and completely captures salient points on flip charts (group memory).
- Draft and distribute meeting summaries as assigned by the co-chairs.

### **Co-chairs**

- Coordinate logistics, including facilities procurement and meeting scheduling.
- Meet with the facilitator prior to meetings to develop agendas, identify purposes and desired outcomes, and design processes to achieve them.
- Distribute agendas to group members prior to meetings.
- Together with the facilitator, ensure the group stays focussed on relevant issues.
- Ensure meeting summaries are drafted and distributed, either personally or by designated group members.
- Together with Diana Ground, track budget balances.

### **DMT representatives**

- Serve as a liaison with the DMT and share group decisions/progress with all DMT members during meetings or teleconferences.
- Provide the group with a broad, division-wide perspective on the entire planning process.
- Make sure the group doesn't stray outside established confines and sideboards set by the DMT.
- Work with group members' supervisors when necessary to resolve time-allocation issues.
- Help resolve conflicts that affect the group's progress or success.

### **Facilitator**

- Meet with the co-chairs prior to the meeting to develop agendas, identify purposes and desired outcomes, and design processes to achieve them.
- Help the group focus their energies on their outlined tasks during meetings.
- Suggest alternative methods and procedures.
- Protect individuals and their ideas from attack.
- Encourage participation.
- Ensure ideas and decisions are accurately and completely captured by the group's recorder.
- Help the group find win/win solutions.

### **Recorder**

- Accurately and completely capture group ideas and decisions on visible flip charts (group memory).
- Number and organize flip chart pages.

### **RESPONSIBILITIES & PROCESS OBJECTIVES**

Work Group: The work group will interact directly with the DMT. Work group members will be given full access to all DMT members both during formally scheduled meetings and informally as questions or needs arise. Specific responsibilities and processes include:

- Identifying public service needs associated with wildlife in Alaska. This should include a brief review of existing services, with recommendations and justification for retaining, modifying, or eliminating them.
- Outlining strategies/programs needed to deliver identified services to the public.
- Developing specific goals and objectives for providing services to the public, and steps and tasks for accomplishing them.
- Developing human and monetary resource cost estimates for annually providing identified public services.
- Determining the group's need for assistance from DWC staff not specifically appointed to the work group and submitting these needs to the DMT for consideration.
- Determining the group's need for assistance or involvement by individuals from outside the division and submitting these needs to the DMT for consideration.

Division Management Team: The DMT will oversee the work group's efforts and provide timely responses to questions and requests. Specific responsibilities and processes include:

- Providing the work group with two DMT members to serve as liaisons between the group and the DMT.
- Providing the work group with a facilitator and meeting recorder.
- Providing oversight and timely answers and direction to the work group.
- Providing funding for the work group's activities.
- Ensuring staff is provided opportunities to comment on and contribute to the development of public service strategies/programs.

### **AUTHORITIES**

Work Group: All work group members have equal status with one another. The work group has the authority to:

- Spend approved funds in ways deemed appropriate to accomplish the group's charge.
- Recommend additional individuals to serve or participate with the group.
- Make recommendations to the DMT.

Division Management Team: The DMT has the authority to:

- Accept or reject work group recommendations, including recommendations of involvement by individuals from within or outside the division.
- Add or replace group members.

### **WORK GROUP MEMBERS, RESOURCES, AND CONSTRAINTS**

- Appointed DWC staff members include Bruce Bartley (co-chair), Lela Chatham, Kalin Kellie, Jackie Kephart, Enid Keyes, Steve Machida (co-chair), Tony Monzingo, Kate Persons, Jeff Selinger, and Bob Sutherland.
- The DMT representatives/liaisons for this group are Jeff Hughes and Steve Schwartz.
- For this work group, Doug Larsen will serve as facilitator and Teri Arnold will serve as recorder.
- The work group will have an initial operating budget of \$10,000. Additional funds may be made available, but must first be approved by the DMT.

### **EXPECTED PRODUCTS AND STANDARDS**

- The work group is expected to produce a report that includes descriptions of prioritized services that DWC should provide to the public, locations where services should be provided, and estimated staffing and costs required to provide the services.
- The group should consider ways to ensure, to the extent practical and desirable, statewide consistency in the substance and delivery of public services.

### **OPERATING PROCEDURES**

- The work group will strive for consensus, but if consensus cannot be achieved in a reasonable amount of time the group will take a majority vote and report both the majority option and other identified options to the DMT.
- All written documents prepared by the work group, including meeting summaries, will be provided to all DMT members.
- DMT members serving on work groups will provide verbal updates to the full DMT membership during DMT meetings or teleconferences. Other group members may address or be present at DMT meetings/teleconferences when this project is discussed.
- Groups should hold meetings in communities and facilities where costs are minimized.
- Every effort should be made to schedule meetings/teleconferences when all members are available. If this is not possible, the work group will meet with a minimum of 70% of its membership.

### **WORKLOAD OF GROUP MEMBERS AND OTHER STAFF**

- The DMT expects group members to attend meetings and complete assignments within agreed upon time frames.
- Work group members should meet with their respective supervisor to adjust their duties and annual work plan as necessary.
- The DMT is aware of staff workloads and will consider suggestions for accommodating work group members' schedules and needs.

### **SCHEDULE AND TIME FRAME**

- The work group will have draft public service strategies/programs identified and outlined in a report to the DMT within nine months of the group's first meeting.
- Work group members will likely spend 60 - 70 hours working on this project. Co-chairs, DMT representatives, and facilitators will likely spend an additional 15 - 20 hours.

### **MONITORING AND EVALUATING**

- Group members will record time they spend on this project.
- The group's co-chairs and DMT representatives will monitor group assignments and ensure follow-through.
- The DMT representatives will discuss with members their contributions to the group and will provide members' supervisors with input for annual performance evaluations.
- Monitoring and evaluating the group's progress will be measured by the group's ability to complete specific objectives by scheduled target dates.
- Group members will review the group's progress and make recommendations to the DMT for changes to the charter or schedule on a quarterly basis, beginning once the group meets for the first time.
- Results and progress of the group will be reported to the DMT during scheduled meetings or teleconferences.
- The group's co-chairs and DMT representatives will ensure that the group's successes and contributions are recognized and acknowledged.

## **B. MEETING SUMMARIES**

**Oct. 25-26, 2000**

Prepared by Bruce Bartley, co-chair

All 10 members of the Public Service Work Group (PSWG) were present, along with DMT liaisons Jeff Hughes and Steve Schwartz and the facilitation staff led by Doug Larsen. Group members are Enid Keyes, Jackie Kephart, Bruce Bartley, Lela Chatham, Kalin Kellie, Steve Machida, Tony Monzingo, Kate Persons, Jeff Selinger and Robert Sutherland.

Doug recapped the Division's strategic planning efforts and how the PSWG came to be. He said the time frame for the group's final report is 9-12 months.

Doug said the DMT has decided public involvement (i.e. surveys, focus groups etc.) will take place after the various work groups finish their work but before the DMT evaluates their reports and makes decisions on what to implement and how.

Doug also provided a status report on the Conservation and Reinvestment Act (CARA), now known not so affectionately as "CARA Lite." The bill, which changes on a daily if not hourly basis, is a scarcely recognizable version of what dominated headlines and deliberations for months. As it now stands, it would provide states with \$50 million the first year with nothing guaranteed after that. State wildlife directors basically have told Congress that tiny sum is a waste of time and they won't even bother applying for it. More significantly, there is in the works an amendment to the Pittman-Robertson law that would incorporate Title III of the original CARA legislation to provide states with offshore leasing money. If adopted, it appears Alaska could get \$2.5 million the first year, on a 3:1 federal:state match. Stay tuned.

Regardless of the fate of CARA-related legislation, DWC's strategic planning process will proceed.

With preliminaries out of the way, the PSWG first considered the role of the DMT liaisons. It was decided they would be able to participate in content discussions but when final decisions (such as prioritizing) are made, they will not participate. It was the feeling of the PSWG that allowing the DMT representatives to participate in the decision making essentially would give them two bites of the apple since the DMT will have the final say on the advisory recommendations forwarded by each work group.

The process for deciding and recording decisions was discussed at length both days. If consensus is not possible, the group decided a vote would be taken and the minority report(s) will be provided. Members who have expressed the minority viewpoint will not be named in the report unless they specifically request it. Still undecided is whether vote totals should be part of the decision report.

There was a lengthy discussion concerning the overlap between education and public service and how to deal with it. Robin Dublin, one of the co-chairs of the Education Work Group, was on hand to listen and participate in the discussion. It was agreed that it was more important that new ideas be developed than which group actually evaluated/developed them. Idea lists generated by the two work groups will be shared and the co-chairs will keep in close touch to ensure none of the ideas "fall through the cracks." The PSWG thought it important to explore how public service supports education and vice versa.

The PSWG spent a considerable amount of time developing a draft goal statement. The draft endured the remainder of Wednesday and most of Thursday before the group realized it wasn't quite the right one. After lengthy soul searching and some pretty impassioned rhetoric, the PSWG adopted the following goal statement:

"The Division of Wildlife Conservation, through all staff, shall seek to achieve the highest level of customer satisfaction. To achieve the highest level of customer satisfaction across all regions, we will:

- a. demonstrate consistent attitudes and behavior toward the public
- b. provide a core of required and elective services
- c. provide consistent and accurate information.”

Revision of the original goal statement was motivated by a strong sentiment that no matter how good the information we provide, it won't be effective or useful if it is not delivered in a polite, courteous manner.

The group generated a list of public services already provided by DWC, a list that consumed numerous pages of flip charts. The length of the list stunned all present. While very few of the items on the lengthy list were new to anyone, it was remarkable to see just how much public service already is provided. The list later will be categorized according to the objectives developed by the PSWG, and evaluated as to whether services should be maintained, improved, de-emphasized or eliminated.

Next, the PSWG brainstormed a list of potential new and/or expanded public services. Again, the list covered multiple flip chart pages. For a complete list, see the end of this document. The sources of these ideas included PSWG members, DWC staff input to PSWG members and some conveyed to PSWG members by the public.

At its next meeting, the PSWG will begin categorizing these ideas according to the objectives the group developed and begin how they might be accomplished.

The PSWG adopted seven objectives to accomplish its goal. They are, not in any order of priority, as follows:

1. Ensure reasonable availability of all licenses, tags, permits, harvest tickets and sealing services throughout the state to facilitate regulatory compliance by hunters
2. Utilize a statewide policy and local protocols to deal with nuisance wildlife
3. Encourage participation in, and understanding of, the regulatory process and the basis for regulatory decisions
4. Develop and implement a multi-level service model (i.e., rural, urban, statewide) that provides consistency and quality at each level with a feedback mechanism for measuring success
5. Provide public service in a manner that achieves the highest level of customer satisfaction (this basically is placeholder language directly from the goal statement)
6. Identify what information and services would help users other than hunters better enjoy and appreciate wildlife; develop and deliver programs and materials to meet those identified needs
7. Develop an education curriculum and campaign to promote public understanding of who we are and what we do as Alaska's primary source of wildlife information (this was viewed by the PSWG as a shared objective with the Education Work Group; we envision the Education Group developing the curriculum and format and the PSWG providing the means (campaign) to distribute it)

The PSWG struggled with how to address the Hunter Information and Training Program. As its very title implies, it consists of education as well as public service. There was reluctance to try to strip out the different components and have each work group deal with their respective components. Everyone agreed HIT is an important public service but is in large part education based. Thus the PSWG decided the Education Work Group should review, and if necessary, revise the existing HIT program.

The PSWG set its next meeting date for Jan. 17-18 at Rabbit Creek Rifle Range.

**Jan. 17-18, 2001**

Prepared by Bruce Bartley, co-chair

Members in attendance included Lela Chatham, Kalin Kellie, Jackie Kephart, Enid Keyes, Steve Machida, Tony Monzingo (first day only), Kate Persons and Bob Sutherland. Jeff Selinger was absent due to a family



emergency. Jeff Hughes and Steve Schwartz served as DMT representatives. Doug Larsen facilitated, Teri Arnold recorded and Margo Matthews attended as a process consultant.

The meeting began with a recap of the previous meeting and the group's charter. Highlights included: the charter's 9-12-month timeframe; public involvement will come after the work groups have made their recommendations; October is probably the earliest we can expect to see the \$2.425 million CARA money through the P-R program; the CARA money is available on a 1:3 match, most of which probably will come from the Fish & Game Fund.

Decisions made at the last meeting regarding operating rules were summarized by Doug. When consensus decisions are not possible, the group will provide a minority report. The names of the dissenters will not be disclosed unless requested by the dissenters. DMT members will be involved in the discussion, but will not vote and will not be involved in issue prioritization.

Enid distributed handouts categorizing by objective the 60 potential new or expanded services identified at the last meeting, a list of current services and a list of proposed/expanded services.

Additional ideas received from staff since last meeting were reviewed and categorized by objectives:

- A. Shooting range activities in Fairbanks and Juneau were not mentioned. We need to maintain and, if possible, expand shooting range opportunities. Because these programs are part of the HIT program, the group decided to hand this issue off to the Education Work Group.
- B. A 24-hour toll-free telephone number needs to be established in each region during the August-October hunting period. This issue was put under Objectives 4 and 5.
- C. Harvest reporting procedures for permit hunts need to be standardized throughout the state. This item was put under the Objective 1.
- D. Improved maps of hunt areas are needed throughout the state. This also was put under the Objective 1.
- E. We need to re-invigorate the advisory committee system. It also needs to better represent a cross section of the public. This item was put under Objective 3.
- F. The work of this group will overlap what has already been done by the Permit Task Force. We need to review its report to make sure we are not re-inventing the wheel. Because this item deals with information the group needs to assess, it was put in the parking lot.
- G. We need to promote a call-in program on TV and radio that feature DWC staff and their programs. This item was put under Objectives 4-7.
- H. A statewide bear management biologist who specializes in addressing nuisance bear problems is needed. This item was placed under the Objective 2.

In the process, the group discussed the possible need for additional objectives to accomplish the group's stated goal. As a result, two more objectives were identified:

8. "Provide timely, accurate, comprehensible (i.e., written in lay terms), concise, complete and easily accessible information regarding all aspects of DWC's activities and functions to all members of the public."

9. "All staff understand the importance of public service and recognize their responsibility in achieving our public service goal."

The group also tinkered slightly with the goal statement to make it read better. It now says:

"The Division of Wildlife Conservation, through all staff, shall seek to achieve the highest level of customer satisfaction across all regions by:

- a. demonstrating consistently professional and courteous behavior toward the public
- b. providing a core of required and elective services
- c. providing consistent and accurate information."

A half dozen ideas for new or expanded services generated at the last meeting didn't seem to fit into any of the objectives, or at least Enid and Jackie (who helped categorize the list) couldn't agree where they belonged. The group dealt with them as follows:

- No. 35 -- New spike-fork/50 video for Southeast: referred to the Education Work Group
- No. 37 -- More researchers involved in public service: referred to the future Research & Management Work Group and placed under Objectives 5 and 8 for further discussion
- No. 46 -- More trapper education: referred to the Education Work Group
- No. 52 -- (Reworded) Provide FWP more information on the rationale behind regulations with respect to wildlife management and public service: placed under Objectives 5 and 8 for further discussion
- No. 53 -- Get rid of proxy system: parking lot
- No. 57 -- (Reworded) Presentation and delivery of Tier II information made more "friendly" to the public: placed under Objectives 1 and 8 for further discussion

All of the morning discussions prompted the group to revisit its goal statement. There was a lengthy discussion over whether it should refer to "customers" or "the public." In the end, the group decided to leave the question unresolved, feeling the answer would become more obvious as things proceeded.

Up to this point, the PSWG was operating under the assumption that it would review existing services and proposed/expanded services, categorize them according to the group's goals and objectives, prioritize them and make recommendations to the DMT on how to accomplish them. That seemingly straightforward approach was clouded considerably after lunch Wednesday.

## CHANGE OF PACE

Doug outlined some of the specifics regarding the "CARA-lite" money that will be routed through the existing P-R program. The Director's plan initially was to develop a budget plan with few details to submit to the Legislature. This would allow the work groups time to develop some recommendations. However, Wayne has received inquiries from several legislators regarding details of how the money will be spent. Doug said Wayne needs definitive proposals within the timeframe of the current legislative session so lawmakers will approve the acceptance of the CARA money and appropriate matching state money.

There appeared to the group to be two options: 1) refuse to be rushed and continue on the course and 9-12-month timeframe envisioned in the charter or 2) try to meet Wayne's needs rather than jeopardize receipt of the CARA money. The group chose the latter.

The group began an effort to try to identify some short-term, accomplishable projects that wouldn't entail long-term staff or resource commitments and were not directed solely at consumptive use. Rationale for this approach came from language submitted with our FY02 budget request to the Legislature, which stated that the intent of Congress in providing these additional P-R funds is to address the unmet funding needs for management of species that are not hunted, wildlife education and wildlife-related outdoor recreation.

Based on this wording, the group decided to focus on nonconsumptive public services for this meeting. Following the meeting, it was learned that the federal legislation may actually be less stringent about uses than suggested by the wording in our legislative budget request. According to a recently received "concept paper," the Commerce, Justice and State Appropriations Act provides \$50 million by creating and authorizing a subaccount under the Pittman-Robertson Act for a Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Program, a formula-based apportionment to states and territories similar to that in existing Sport Fish and Wildlife Restoration Programs. Guidance provided in the bill and report language require that:

1. These funds are to be used for the development and implementation of wildlife conservation and restoration programs and plans, including wildlife conservation, wildlife conservation education and wildlife-associated recreation projects.

2. Priority for funding from the Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Account shall be for those species with the greatest conservation needs as defined by the state wildlife conservation and restoration program.

When examining new or expanded services, Doug outlined and suggested the following problem solving model to work through identified issues.

- 1) Identify problem(s) created by the issue.
- 2) Look at the specific services that would address the identified problem(s).
- 3) Identify who the audience is that the service will target.
- 4) Identify appropriate delivery methods.
- 5) Identify how these new services/projects will be evaluated.

The group examined the list of more than 60 potential new or expanded services and selected about a dozen it felt met the criteria. The remainder of Wednesday was spent developing recommendations for two of them.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The proposal receiving the most votes for an immediate recommendation was the use of more commercials and public service announcements (No. 24 in the “new/expanded list”) to convey a variety of messages. The group felt commercials/PSAs fell under objectives 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7.

The differences between commercials and PSAs and their relative effectiveness were explored. The group agreed that commercials, while expensive, are more effective because they can be tailored to specific rather than the shotgun approach of PSAs.

Tony said that based on his experience with the Hunter Information and Training program, it costs \$8,000-\$10,000 to film a one-minute professional grade commercial. Running the commercial costs \$3,000-\$5,000 a month, depending on time slots and the particular television station.

The group agreed it would be best to have an ad agency handle placement of the commercials for any sort of organized advertising campaign. It said commercials should be multi-lingual and specific to urban and rural audiences. Radio and newspapers should be added into the mix so the most appropriate media is used for each audience. DEC has done commercials promoting use of auto electrical plug-ins during the winter. Bob agreed to contact DEC and check on the effectiveness of these ads and how they were put together.

The group identified three broad themes the advertising campaign should cover: Living with wildlife (in both urban and rural settings), safety with respect to wildlife, their use and appreciation, and who we (DWC) are and what we do. More specifically, some topics identified were bears and garbage, nuisance moose, traveling in bear country, etiquette around wildlife, and outdoor survival while enjoying/using wildlife.

To evaluate the effectiveness of the commercials, the group suggested pre- and post-campaign surveys, changes in DLP statistics, and changes in the number of nuisance wildlife calls.

For a one-year, multi-media campaign focusing on 6-8 distinct messages, the group estimated the cost at \$250,000.

## **RECOMMENDATION...BUT NOT YET**

The second proposal considered at length was No. 9, interactive kiosks for conveying messages to the public. There was some discussion of the relationship between No. 9 and No. 1 (automated/electronic one-

stop shopping for information and services). Because No. 1 was related to "shopping" and required access to financial services administered by the Division of Administration, the DWC would not be able to quickly and unilaterally implement this new service. The group decided that No. 9 should also include web-based services as well as interactive kiosks.

The group identified a need for the public/customer to access a multitude of information by means other than Internet access. The technology is known as "touch screen" technology. It is visual, menu driven so the consumer selects the desired information, multi-layered so the consumer gets the degree of detail desired and can be designed to serve non-consumptive as well as consumptive users.

The group envisions the kiosks be designed similar to automated teller machines (ATMs) so they could be available for use 24/7. Among the possible sites would be every DWC office statewide, major airports and visitor centers.

Information available would include wildlife species, populations, distribution, viewing opportunities and harvest data. Ideally, the kiosks concept could be expanded later to sell licenses and tags and issue harvest tickets as envisioned by No. 1 (automated one-stop shopping). But for the short term, information services would be the priority because of potential obstacles to financial transactions.

The kiosk technology exists and is relatively inexpensive. Much of the information to be provided already is in hand, but not in a centralized location. The costs will be obtaining the necessary hardware and software, designing the system and creating a position responsible for compiling the information to be provided.

Obviously, such a project would not be accomplishable in one year. It will take several years to fully develop and implement. Nevertheless, the group felt the concept important enough that we should begin taking steps now, some of which could be accomplished short-term.

The group identified five phases to the project: requirements analysis, design, software/hardware/initial deployment and expanded deployment. Analysis and design would be done by contract with experts outside the agency. Ongoing maintenance would be handled by the division's web master. The initial deployment would be in Anchorage, Fairbanks and Juneau. More sites would be added as performance dictates.

The group also suggested we approach Sport Fish about whether it would be willing to go in as partner with us.

Because of a lack of knowledge on the cost of "touch screen" technology, the group was unable to put a price tag on the project. It was suggested that if the recommendation is accepted, the DMT specify an amount of money for one or more phases of the project to be accomplished in the first year of CARA funding.

## **COURSE CORRECTION**

When group members returned Thursday, it was obvious there was some uneasiness over the direction things had taken the previous afternoon (Tony was out sick and Steve was dealing with a household crisis). A lengthy discussion ensued over whether this prioritization of short-term projects was derailing the overall planning efforts. Concerns were voiced that looking only at proposed CARA projects was being done at the expense of existing services. Concern also was expressed that existing needs in rural Alaska (i.e., more help with basic hunter services and the regulatory process) would not be met by the process. Another existing service that needs additional attention is GIS staffing.

So the group modified its approach. It decided to examine existing services with an eye toward improving them, and then prioritize them along with proposed new/expanded services.

In doing do, the group backed away from its previous criteria of minimizing permanent staff and focusing only on services accomplishable in the short term. It decided it would consider permanent positions as need dictated and the time crunch would be dealt with by phasing things in a year at a time.

The group examined the 70+ existing services (Attachment A) and picked nine priority items. It then combined those with the new/expanded priorities developed earlier. That combined list of 19 proposals was then prioritized and the group began working on recommendations.

The group re-emphasized several points. First, the recommendations were being made under the duress of time (the need for legislative action this session), distorting the process. Second, this accelerated effort was a one-time event designed to help meet Wayne's immediate need. Third, the group reserves the right to revisit the priorities on its list of recommendations once all proposals have been considered. And fourth, after this immediate crisis passed, the group intends to go back to its original process and evaluate and prioritize proposals in a deliberate manner. Finally, these recommendations are constrained by the assumed strict guidelines associated with non-game and non-consumptive use. The group's final list of recommendations may be different because many of our public services are directed at hunters and trappers.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

From the combined list of proposals, handling nuisance/distressed animals emerged as the top priority. It clearly addresses the group's second objective and there was a consensus that this is a valid public service and one that demands a great deal of time and resources.

There are more distressed nuisance calls than we can respond to, there is strong public concern, responding eats up the time staff has to do its assigned work, the public doesn't understand the expense involved in relocating and/or rehabilitating wildlife, and the public has difficulty distinguishing between nuisances and threats.

To resolve the problems listed above, the group first discussed the delivery method. It agreed there needs to be a variety of information conveyed to the public through multi-lingual multi-media on how to prevent/avoid the problem. Messages need to be tailored to specific audiences (rural vs. urban, hunter vs. non-hunter, etc.). There are seasonal considerations. The messages must be species specific and address specific solutions. But more than anything else, the group said, more personnel are needed to deal with the issue.

The group recommends more staff be added specifically to deal with nuisance/distressed animal calls. Long-term, that means adding more permanent positions as nuisance wildlife specialists. Short-term, it can be dealt with by adding seasonal technician time.

The idea of contracting out such work was discussed. While that may be possible, it appears there are numerous legal and liability obstacles that could preclude such action any time soon.

By way of developing a cost estimate, the group identified the following personnel needs:

Region II: 1 permanent full-time position (WB I) in Anchorage; 18 months of Tech III time (three techs, six months each

Region I: 1 permanent full-time position (WBI) in Juneau, six months of Tech III time in Ketchikan

Region III: 1 permanent full-time position in Fairbanks; 6 months of roving tech time

Region V: 1 statewide person to turn to for advice, to develop educational materials and messages.

Statewide: 1 permanent full-time position (WB II) to oversee program, evaluate regional efforts, and provide the kind of resources identified by Region V to all the regions.

As envisioned by the group, these personnel would be similar to wildlife extension agents, a concept already being utilized in some Lower 48 state like Montana. Certainly they wouldn't be responding to nuisance calls all day every day. When not responding to such calls, they would be traveling around their respective regions, distributing materials designed to prevent/avoid future nuisance/distress calls.

The program could be evaluated by a decrease in the number of nuisance/distress calls, fewer DLPs and the ability of area biologists to get their other work done.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The next most important public service identified by the group (within the CARA constraints discussed previously) was to provide information on wildlife populations, status, density, etc. Again, this is an existing service (No. 11), but one which needs to be improved significantly and innovatively, according to the group. It meets objectives 5, 6 and 8 previously identified by the group.

There is an insatiable audience for such information from the public/customer as well as local, state and federal agencies. The audience was defined as just about everybody with an interest in wildlife. We lack a centralized database, which should include survey and research data. The information needs to be comprehensible to a general audience and should be so oriented, rather than aimed at a scientific/professional audience. Such information is in demand and appeals to all user groups and is the topic of questions often asked. We don't need to gather new data; we just need to consolidate what we have.

As a starting point, it was suggested that each area biologist produce an annual "state of the unit" report similar to what Region II just did with its briefing book for the upcoming Board of Game meeting.

Some concern was expressed about the reluctance of some biologists to give out numbers which could be misinterpreted by a lack of narrative and analysis.

Delivery of such information needs to be through a variety of mechanisms. Among those identified were the interactive kiosks discussed earlier, the website, brochures, handouts (including the many that already exist), and possibly a magazine. It is important to budget money to reprint handouts and brochures. In the past, many well-done, informative publications have been produced, but once the initial printing was exhausted there was no funding for more.

While some of the costs of this recommendation are intermingled with the delivery mechanisms, the group identified two specific personnel needs: a permanent full-time position to manage publications statewide; and a permanent full-time position to oversee consolidation and updating the information, and disseminating it to the regions, the website, the kiosks, the publications person, etc.

Evaluation suggestions included the number of publications requested, the number of web site/kiosk hits and a public survey to determine the effectiveness of various delivery methods.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The third recommendation to be forwarded to the DMT is the need for a well-developed and well-maintained DWC web site. This need is tied in with the interactive kiosk needs discussed the previous day.

The group concluded the only way to do that is to create a permanent full-time webmaster position (Range 18 AP III).

A fully functioning web site would help address seven (1 and 3-8) of the group's nine objectives.

The potential audience is large and international in scope. The group agreed there is ever increasing demand, both internally and externally, for information available through a web site. (Although it wasn't addressed specifically, a recent study shows two of every three Alaska households have a computer, the highest percentage in the United States). A good web site enables us to reach wider, less traditional constituencies.

DWC does not have a web master. Phil Koehl has been doing an excellent job of managing the division's web site, but he has other responsibilities, and he is retiring soon.

The group addressed the possible need for a GIS specialist to assist the web master. The two skills are separate and distinct. Becky Straugh has been doing a wonderful job with GIS, but again she has other responsibilities.

The group also pointed out that having a fully functioning web site dovetails, and in fact is essential, to several of its other recommendations.

The need for regional web masters (sites) was discussed. The concern was that adding those positions immediately, before the DWC site was functioning as envisioned, might overload the statewide position.

The group recommended a two-phase approach as a delivery method:

- 3) immediately hiring a web master (Range 18 AP III) and a GIS expert (Range 18 AP III)
- 4) add regional web masters as needed

Evaluation could be done by recording and analyzing web site hits. The technology exists to track those hits very specifically by location as well as just raw numbers.

The fourth and final recommendation was the one developed Wednesday to launch an advertising campaign on selected topics.

## **THINGS TO THINK ABOUT**

Lacking sufficient time to develop any more recommendations, the group pondered an observation by Enid. Looking at the recommendations already made, and the list of potential ones, Enid suggested we may be looking at creating a new, separate section (no name suggested) to accomplish much of our public service work. She suggested that given the overall similarity of their purpose, we might consider housing this section together and hire people who specialize in information technology and customer service rather than our more traditional biological backgrounds. Finally, she suggested the Potter Marsh Visitor Center (now under development) might be a logical headquarters for much of this information production and distribution.

The concept was identified as something the group – and the staff – should mull over before the next PSWG meeting March 20-21 in Anchorage.

Assignments: Bob will contact DEC about its advertising campaign

Parking lot items:

- 1) How does this work group communicate progress to the staff
- 2) Review of the Permit Task Force and recommendations needs to be incorporated in our report

- 3) How do we provide opportunities for the public and staff to review issues and provide input
  - 4) Proxy system needs to be overhauled
- Query public as to how they perceive themselves (public vs. customer)

## **March 20-21, 2001**

Prepared by Bruce Bartley, co-chair

Members in attendance included Lela Chatham, Kalin Kellie, Jackie Kephart, Steve Machida, Tony Monzingo, Kate Persons, Bob Sutherland and Jeff Selinger. Enid Keyes was absent due to illness. DMT representative Steve Schwartz was absent due to a court appearance. The other DMT representative, Jeff Hughes, attended Thursday morning. Doug Larsen facilitated, Teri Arnold recorded and Margo Matthews attended as a process consultant.

The meeting began with a review of accomplishments to date and our instructions from Wayne regarding the urgency for recommendations to be considered in this legislative session. With respect to the PSWG deliberations, the time crunch no longer is an issue and we are free to resume the evaluation process we initiated at earlier meetings.

With several other work groups beginning to gear up, the PSWG agreed it should be able to complete its work with one additional meeting April 17-19.

Doug began the process by going around the room and asking each group member for an item of concern not yet addressed. The resulting 16 suggestions were combined and boiled down to 10. The last of the 10 was DWC's role in the development of shooting ranges. Because discussion of the issue was well under way, the group decided to go ahead and hash it out before prioritizing the order of discussion for the others.

## **SHOOTING RANGES**

The issue identified was whether encouraging development of shooting ranges around the state addressed the mission of wildlife conservation by reducing wounding loss and improving the public's perception of hunters.

Almost by definition, shooting ineptitude results in wounding loss. If wounding loss is greater than the 17 percent most commonly factored into most management calculations, it has serious management implications. Based on results from sighting-in days and other activities offered at the Rabbit Creek Rifle Range, Tony said it appears very probable that wounding loss could be twice as high. A lack of ranges means hunters have limited options for developing or maintaining shooting proficiency.

Not having formal ranges results in informal sites being trashed, giving hunters a bad image even though much of the problem probably isn't attributable to hunters. Kate noted that lack of formal ranges is not as a big problem in rural Alaska where makeshift practice sites are the rule rather than the exception. She also said the high price of ammunition makes it unrealistic to expect rural residents to spend money shooting at things they can't eat.

Options identified for dealing with the problem were outdoor ranges (because indoor ranges don't accommodate the weapons typically used by hunters), proficiency testing, electronic "virtual" shooting systems and clinics put on by DWC.

Obstacles to shooting range development include cost, staffing and maintenance, potential utilization, liability, land acquisition, public acceptance and local land use regulations. Among the potential benefits



identified: more cost effective than indoor ranges; probably self-sufficient in urban areas (as Rabbit Creek is); reduced wounding loss; and improved public perception of hunters.

Without facilities, the concept of shooting proficiency is meaningless. It was pointed out that proficiency is not a one-time accomplishment but a skill that must be maintained through ongoing practice. Perhaps the most significant obstacle to any kind of mandatory proficiency requirement would be political opposition from adult hunters. Some suggestions for overcoming that opposition are incentives to encourage people to become and stay proficient, such as a “master hunter” program similar to Oregon and Minnesota and extra chances in popular Alaska drawing permit hunts.

The benefits of proficiency requirements include reduced wounding loss and retaining/regaining hunting opportunity by improving public perception.

“Virtual” shooting systems like the DART systems we already have become much cheaper and more portable. But cost remains an issue with the new LaserShot system running about \$12,600 a copy. Nevertheless, they are cheap on a per shooter basis, demonstrate the need for education and proficiency, provide moving targets, are compatible with schools, and provide great public relations vehicles for spreading related messages. Drawbacks are the lack of realistic sound and recoil, both of which affect shooting proficiency.

## VENDORS, VENDORS EVERYWHERE

After lunch Wednesday, the group prioritized the remaining nine items for purposes of discussion. First on the list was a desire to see a license vendor and fur sealer in almost every community in the state. Currently, in some parts of the state, there is no practical way for people to comply with regulatory requirements with regard to licenses, tags, harvest tickets, some permits and sealing of furbearers and bears. Low profitability and the way Licensing has dealt with vendors makes it unappealing in many areas. Having more fur sealers available was identified as a way to improve the accuracy of our furbearer harvest data.

Among the solutions suggested was paying license vendors/fur sealers a monthly fee (\$50) whether or not they sell any licenses or seal any furs. Currently vendors are paid only by the licenses and tags they sell and the harvest tickets they issue. Those commissions would remain in place, in addition to the \$50 monthly stipend. Increased fur sealers is seen as a way to provide better harvest data.

To facilitate a statewide vendor/sealer program, the group decided there needs to be a new clerical level position in each region devoted primarily to coordination. Because personal or telephone contact is more effective than written instructions in many rural areas, travel would be required to set up and instruct new vendors and regular telephone contact would be maintained to ensure collection reports, overlays, unused seals and sealing reports are delivered in a timely manner. The group also felt a statewide coordinator was necessary to supervise the regional clerks and provide liaison with Information Management and Licensing.

Such a program should be coordinated with Sport Fish and Commercial Fish for which licensing also is an issue.

Cost was the primary obstacle identified. DWC must retain the authority to decide how many vendors/sealers are necessary in each community. Potential vendors/sealers (or their employees) would have to agree to undergo DWC training. Only people willing to be both a vendor and sealer would be eligible. Materials must be multi-lingual and ADA compliant as necessary.

Another possible alternative would be to contract such services with native corporations but it was rejected as even more expensive and probably unrealistic.

## PUBLIC SERVICE SPECIALISTS

Thursday began with a discussion of the need for public service specialists at the area office level. The lack of such personnel generated a long list of problems:

- Staff going in too many directions; multitude of tasks means staff cannot devote quality time to any one of them
- Information and its delivery is inconsistent between offices
- Lack of time to do outreach outside of area office
- ABs lack the time and budget to do more than minimal field work; while veteran ABs can rely on past field work to make decisions, new ABs desperately need time in the field to learn and do their jobs well
- Uncompensated overtime
- Inability to make informed management decisions with consequent decrease/loss of credibility
- Employee burn-out

In essence, the group found public service increasingly competes with traditional activities, detracting from our goal of maintaining wildlife management expertise and our vision of providing excellence in public service. The problem is only likely to get worse as there will be greater expectations of public service with the advent of CARA funding.

One alternative obviously is to reduce the public services we provide, and focus on doing a good job on our remaining tasks. The group rejected the idea. Instead, the group adopted a three-pronged approach: add staff, work smarter by using technology and reorder priorities.

Toward that end, the group recommended a public service specialist be added to each area office. More than one should be added in those offices that deal with the bulk of the population. In other words, the size of the public service staff should be commensurate with the number of people served.

A new job class should be created, one which emphasizes a background in education and public speaking rather than strictly biology. In some area offices, the position would entail a considerable amount of travel to outlying areas to provide necessary public services.

A regional coordinator would supervise the efforts of these specialists, provide message content and direction. And a statewide coordinator would act as a clearinghouse for what various regions and area offices are doing and its applicability elsewhere. While the group was reluctant to be so presumptuous as to speak on behalf of the Education Work Group, the PSWG felt these new positions could and probably should have an education component to them.

Besides cost, the biggest obstacle identified in developing a consistent model of providing public services on a rural, urban and statewide basis was the need for a change in our corporate culture which has evolved into a great deal of regional and area autonomy. In recognition of that culture, group members went to great length to emphasize that the job of the statewide coordinator would NOT be to impose programs on regions or area offices.

There was considerable discussion about the wisdom of trying to develop a public service delivery model when it is not yet clear from the public about what services they want/need/deem important. Whatever public input is solicited later in the strategic planning process must address these wants/needs.

## TELL 'EM WHAT WE KNOW

The next item addressed better ways of getting information from managers and researchers to the public in a timely fashion. The group feels the public is unaware of many wildlife programs and unable to access the information we have collected.

Among the problems identified are an inability to retrieve harvest data in a timely manner, accuracy, unavailability of information to the public in an understandable format, the need to incorporate new data as it is received, and an inability to conveniently or accurately find statewide harvest and population figures.

The group feels that when we report what we know, it shows/tells what we do.

Among the solutions/alternatives: modernize (automate) information management data systems to provide more timely and accurate data to ABs, staff and the public, and an annual "State of the Unit" report (similar to the one done biannually by Region II prior to the BOG meeting) to be posted in a variety of media.

One of the problems identified by the group was that area offices don't get sealing information to IM in a timely manner. The PSWG recommended the Management and Research Work Group investigate this as part of its assignment.

One of the potential obstacles is the willingness of ABs to provide data and analysis. Again, the Management and Research Work Group needs to examine what data (and to what depth/degree) is appropriate for the kind of widespread dissemination envisioned by the PSWG.

The PSWG feels one of the most effective methods of communicating the information would be through the public service technicians identified earlier. We need a program to coordinate getting data from IM and disseminating it. The program would be one of the primary responsibilities of the statewide public service coordinator identified earlier.

It was pointed out that federal agencies are very good at this information dissemination. They have lots of money and people to promote their role, even though they actually gather very little data. ADF&G gathers lots of information but doesn't do very well at getting it out.

## EXPANDED HOURS

Even when we have information and service programs in place, they aren't always readily available to a public that works normal business hours. This topic generated plenty of pointed comments along with recognition that some of the problems will have to be addressed by other work groups and even other divisions within ADF&G.

Basically stated, the problem is that inadequacies in facilities, parking, hours, phones and staffing are detracting from our ability to provide core services.

Most people work at jobs where they have little or no time to access ADF&G services 8-5 Monday through Friday. Frustration, anger and resentment are by-products of the inability to access services.

Problems specific to the Anchorage office were discussed at length. The phone system came in for a great deal of criticism for outdated messages and the difficulty of reaching a real person instead of a recording. Having two buildings, splitting off a significant portion of the staff, and having separate wildlife and sport fish information centers were perceived negatively. Parking problems are well known.

The design and space of the Fairbanks office was cited as the ideal for urban offices. The group said similar facilities are needed for Anchorage, Palmer, Soldotna and Douglas.

Single-staffed rural offices don't have the exact same problems, but the modular unit recently put into service in Delta Junction was cited as the ideal for rural areas.

The PSWG recommended the information centers in Anchorage, Palmer, Soldotna, Douglas and Fairbanks remain open until 6 p.m. on weekdays and that they be open on Saturdays. The recommendation is contingent on acceptance of an earlier recommendation that at least one new public service specialist be assigned to every area office in the state. The number of services available of Saturdays may have to be curtailed because of staffing issues and it may be necessary only to have those offices open on Saturdays during the primary hunting seasons (fall).

Exactly how hours should be extended and what services should be provided should be one of the primary questions addressed by whatever public input work is done to support the strategic planning process. It was also noted that Big Admin undoubtedly will have lots to say about what buildings can be opened and when and about staffing issues.

The phone system in the Anchorage office drew enough complaints that the PSWG recommended someone be assigned with the primary job responsibility of keeping the system updated and working.

## ADVISORY COMMITTEES

The most heated discussion of the two-day meeting was over the suggestion that we need to work to reinvigorate the advisory committee process.

After considerable debate, the PSWG defined the problem thusly: Lack of financial support and awareness of the AC system has made the system ineffective, and in some cases allowed committees to be captured by special interests. The ineffectiveness of the AC system is illustrated by the BOG's selective use of AC input and its tendency to by-pass the AC system on controversial issues.

In rural areas, the biggest problem seems to be money. For many there is not enough to hold the two meetings a year required by law for ACs to be considered alive and functioning. Most rural areas represent multiple villages and members have to fly to meetings.

When it is possible for two meetings a year, one is typically devoted entirely to fish. That leaves one meeting in which rural ACs have time only to comment on proposals by others, not to consider and develop their own proposals.

Rural AC representatives cannot afford to stay for the duration of BOG meetings, thus have less influence with BOG members than urban ACs whose representatives are available to lobby at every break. The problem is magnified by the recent tendency of the BOG to call AC representatives to the table when deliberating proposals specific to that AC's area.

The AC problems in urban areas are very different. While rural ACs generally reflect community demographics, urban ACs do not. Non- and anti-hunting groups feel they cannot/will not operate within the AC system. Instead, they make their voices heard in other forums like the Legislature and the ballot box.

Some urban ACs are dominated by special interests and don't even represent the full spectrum of the local hunting community. The makeup of the ACs is not representative of that community's opinions about wildlife.

And of course, in both rural and urban areas, many people don't even know the AC system exists.

While recognizing that DWC's options for retooling AC membership are limited by statute, the PSWG made the following recommendations:

- ADF&G needs to do a better job of financially supporting rural ACs

- AC meeting dates and summaries of what occurred at those meetings should be posted in every area office
- Handouts should be developed explaining the BOG and AC process
- ADF&G should provide logistical and financial support for annual meetings of AC representatives from throughout each region to discuss their concerns and needs.
- To the extent possible, AC members should be appointed to public work groups/committees chartered by ADF&G and the BOG.

## **April 17-19, 2001**

Prepared by Steve Machida, co-chair

**Meeting Goal:** Complete all agenda items and the work group's charge.

**Desired Outcomes:**

- List of external public sources from whom to solicit future planning input
- List of recommended strategies for dealing with public service needs
- Outline of the structure, content and timeline of the work group's final report

**Participants:**

Members: Kalin Kellie, Bruce Bartley, Lela Chatham, Jackie Kephart, Enid Keyes, Tony Monzingo, Kate Persons, Jeff Selinger, Steve Machida

Facilitator: Doug Larsen

Recorder: Teri Arnold

Process: Margo Matthews

DMT Liason: Jeff Hughes, Steve Scharwtz

## **Meeting Introduction**

Doug Larsen began the meeting at 8:40 AM on Tuesday, April 17 with a review of the proposed agenda, meeting goal and desired outcomes. All group members were present except Bob Sutherland. The previous meeting was briefly summarized and a revised statement of goals, objectives and links to strategic issues was passed out to group members. The group briefly reviewed Bob Sutherland's memo regarding the energy conservation commercials produced by the Department of Environmental Conservation. The group was also provided an update regarding the GIS mapping work completed by Becky Straugh from IM. Group members were given her website address and asked to look at the hunt area maps produced so far and provide feedback regarding the utility of the products.

The two remaining strategic issues from the last meeting were discussed at this point: 1) private land ownership and trespass problems; and, 2) improve communication with rural village constituencies. Doug reminded the group that we needed to 1) identify the problem; 2) develop a problem statement; 3) list possible solutions; 4) identify possible obstacles to success or implementation; 5) evaluate the potential costs; and, 6) identify ways that success could be evaluated.

## **Discussion of Strategic Issues**

**Strategic Issue:** Private land ownership and trespass problems

**Problem Identification:**

- The public is frequently unable to distinguish between private and public lands. This create conflicts with landowners, and generates a poor public image of wildlife users and the DWC.

- We need to do a better job of providing to information center and area staff quality land ownership maps for use by the public.
- Some agencies outside of ADFG are acquiring lands for public access, and the information is not always effectively disseminated.
- Land ownership and management information comes from a variety of sources, and is frequently confusing to the public.
- Properly complying with the regulations depends on knowing the location of boundaries; the maps we produce in the handy-dandy are of insufficient quality to properly depict boundaries.
- Management staff is occasionally frustrated in its efforts to manage hunts because of the preponderance of private lands found in some hunt areas. An example would be the Homer cow moose hunt in Unit 15C; much of the public opposition to this hunt comes from landowners who are frustrated by the trespass that occurs during the hunting season.

The group concluded that this strategic issue fits best under objectives #6. The group also discussed whether it could fit under objective #1. Knowing where to hunt is just as important as obtaining a license or harvest ticket. However, the group decided not to place it under objective #1 because its presence could potentially dilute the original intent of this objective.

Bruce developed the following problem statement that was accepted by the group:

Problem Statement: The difficulty the public has in identifying land ownership creates management and trespass problems, frustrates our ability to meet wildlife population objectives and generates a poor image of wildlife users.

Solutions:

- We need to evaluate whether the existing land ownership databases from DNR could be overlaid onto our hunt area map databases. However, Steve Schwartz pointed out that this would not be a small project, and the number of potential complications would be numerous.
- If our improved GIS capability enables us to provide better quality maps, we would need kiosks in area offices that would be capable of accessing and displaying this information. Improved hard copies would still be needed at area offices and vendors.
- Higher quality maps are needed in the handy-dandy.
- We need to especially highlight state lands that are open for access.
- We need to focus in on problem areas or "hot spots" and not worry about the remainder of the state. Tina Cuning's ANILCA group provides this service; this effort needs to be upgraded.
- The maps in the original federal subsistence regulation book were of higher quality. We need to investigate whether these types of maps would meet our needs.

Enid provided a note of caution, however. A recent violation at McHugh Creek regarding an illegally taken sheep was thrown out by a jury because all the additional information provided by ADFG was perceived as leading to increased regulatory complexity. This is an issue that would need further deliberation by another workgroup or the DMT.

Potential Obstacles:

- Potential problems of working with other agencies such as DNR and BLM are unknown. Integrating databases would be problematic as well.
- Improving the quality of maps in the handy-dandy would require more expensive paper stock. This would greatly inflate the cost of production.
- We need to identify the level of specificity and detail that would be needed by the public. This would vary greatly among the different hunts offered throughout the state.
- Availability of suitable staff to accomplish this task would be a significant obstacle. Even limiting our efforts to "hot spots" would still require significant staff time.
- Our legal liability represents an unknown, and would need to be fully evaluated.

Costs:

- Additional staffing to produce maps and upgrade our GIS capability
- Costs attributable to production, inventory and distribution of map products

Evaluation:

- A before and after questionnaire for selected problem hunts could be administered.
- Look for evidence of more successful management, and fewer violations and complaints from the public

**Strategic Issue:** Need for improvement in lines of communication with rural, village residents

Problem Identification:

- Lack of agreement regarding the need for wildlife conservation among some village residents
- Poor relationship and communication with ADFG staff
- Negative impacts on some wildlife populations
- Missed opportunities for management solutions that would benefit both the resource and users
- Lack of understanding by ADFG staff of existing viewpoints and resource use (i.e. need for taking cow moose for potlatches)
- Poor communication negatively affects the opportunities of other users to access private lands
- Existing mode of delivery of public services not always appropriate for village Alaska

It was pointed out that problems attributable to governance disputes and sovereignty are not solvable by the DWC. We need to maintain our focus of improving relationships at the local level.

Problem Statement: Due to differing core values, we have not effectively established working relationships with local, village communities which contributes to inconsistent views and heightens conflicts regarding how wildlife should be managed.

Solutions:

- Foster partnerships with local village councils and native corporations
- Increase efforts to travel to communities to talk about problems and solutions; suggest partnerships to attain common goals and objectives
- Create positions within villages similar to the federal Refuge Information Technician series
- Ensure that rural Public Service Specialists are from the local area and, if necessary, bilingual
- Use local residents as observers for surveys and telemetry flights
- Incorporate more local, traditional knowledge into our messages
- Incorporate additional ways that staff can attain work experience in rural, bush Alaska
- Increase availability of appropriate cross-cultural training for all staff
- Invite representatives from rural Alaska to participate in DWC staff meetings

Obstacles:

- Limitations of staff time, particularly by area staff
- The financial cost of doing business in bush Alaska is extremely high
- Difficulty of finding local residents who are qualified and willing to work for us
- Some staff may be unwilling to change how we conduct business in rural Alaska
- Some village residents are not always willing to talk with government representatives
- Cultural differences in communication style may exist
- Staff turnover increases the difficulty of improving our ability to communicate with rural residents

Costs:

- The financial cost of conducting meetings and planning in rural Alaska
- Costs associated with staff time
- Perceived loss of control by management staff

Evaluation:

- Improvement in communication and increase in the number of cooperative projects
- Increase in the number of regulatory proposals to the BOG
- Increase in the number of staff who are from bush Alaska

At this point, the group discussed what to do with Objective #7 which addressed development of an educational curriculum and campaign to promote public understanding of who we are and what we do as Alaska's primary source of wildlife information. This objective was originally viewed by the group as a shared objective with the education work group. After some discussion, the group decided that this objective could be incorporated with Objective #8 which addressed providing timely, accurate, comprehensible, concise, complete and easily accessible information regarding all aspects of our activities and functions. Incorporating these two objectives reduced the total number of objectives from 9 to 8. The second strategic issue ("Tell 'em what we know") was modified to accommodate this change. The following additional wording was added to the issue statement: "Providing this information will enhance the public's understanding of who we are and what we do as Alaska's primary source of wildlife information."

The group now focused their attention on Objective #8 (formerly #9) which addressed the need to impress more fully on all staff their responsibility and need to participate in public service. This objective did not have a strategic issue associated with it and the group decided to develop one.

**Strategic Issue:** Need for improving staff commitment to public service

Problem Identification:

- Some area offices will not return long distance phone calls made by members of the public
- Some staff are not willing to help with front counter duties when asked
- Some staff are not willing to make public presentations or write articles for a lay audience
- Public service is a low priority for some staff in terms of time and funding
- Some staff are contemptuous of the public, resulting in an elitist attitude

Problem Statement: Not all staff demonstrate a commitment to excellence in public service. This results in: a) lack of public confidence, support and funding; b) decline in customer satisfaction; and c) misplaced focus of management and research efforts.

Because of the potential controversy that would be associated with this issue, the group decided that a more precise definition of public service is needed. They decided that "public service includes presentations, talking with the public who have questions on in-person basis, radio broadcasts, lay articles, contributing to ADFG publications and determining what the public wants."

Solutions:

- Public service duties need to be incorporated into the PD of all employees
- Time should be allocated for all employees to conduct public service duties
- Additional training is needed to enable more staff to work at the front counter
- Work with the local universities to discourage development of elitist attitudes
- Addressing public service responsibilities should be a part of every new employee's orientation
- Encourage development of lay writing and public speaking skills in all employees
- Conduct a survey of the public to determine the significance and breadth of this problem
- Allocate resources to fund Public Service Specialists who would be able to provide training

Obstacles:

- Funding of additional training may be a problem
- Employee attitudes are usually entrenched and frequently difficult to change
- Supervisors may not always be sympathetic with this problem

Costs:

- Financial costs for training and for Public Service Specialist positions
- Attitude adjustments usually are accompanied by a morale cost

Evaluation:

- Follow-up surveys or focus groups would be beneficial to see if service improves
- Improvement in attitudes among staff



- Increased support from the public for DWC programs

The group now focused their attention on several previously identified issues that were not discussed or placed under an objective.

Shooting Ranges: This issue was discussed at length during the previous meeting, but no decision was made regarding priority. The group decided to place it under Objective #5.

Modernize IM databases: The group decided to add this as a "solution" under Objective #7 (formerly #8), strategic issue "Tell 'em what we know".

Improved GIS capability: The group decided to add this as a "solution" under strategic issues "Division webmaster" and "land status information".

More enforcement: Doug outlined what is being done at HQ regarding the Department's enforcement policy. Staff will continue to conduct enforcement, and we will continue to send new employees to the State Trooper Academy for enforcement training. Some of the unresolved questions are:

- Carrying of firearms for ADF&G enforcement activities?
- Will employees who do not have enforcement duties be required to turn in their badges?
- Is the expectation the same for 20-year retirement employees as for 30-year employees?
- Is recurrent training necessary?

The group decided that the issue needs further discussion among the other workgroups and DWC employees, and would be included as an appendix to the other issues and objectives in the final report. The following strategic issue statement was developed: "We make management decisions based on a level of compliance with the regulations, but due to a lack of enforcement, it does not always happen."

More Predator Management: The group discussed this issue briefly at the previous meeting. They had decided to refer this issue to the research/management workgroup.

Miscellaneous Actions: The group addressed the following miscellaneous topics.

- *Centralized versus de-centralized administrative structure*: Some confusion existed as to whether this subject was an issue and what exactly it addresses. The problem is that statewide coordinators have oversight over statewide programs but exercise no control over regional and area staff who are needed to locally administer the statewide programs. It was suggested that these statewide coordinators need dedicated staff in the different regions. The current administrative structure which emphasizes regional autonomy provides the DWC the flexibility it needs to adapt programs to diversity of management situations we currently see. The infrastructure work group needs to carefully balance the need for flexibility at the regional level with the consistency needed at the statewide level.
- *Modification of Objective #6*: The group decided that Objective #6 should address "all users" instead of "users other than hunters".
- *Public services to non-hunters*: This issue was flagged as a strategic issue for the Watchable Wildlife and Existing Management/Research work groups to address.

## **Prioritization of Objectives and Strategic Issues**

Doug led the group in a discussion of how the different objectives and issues would be prioritized. The discussion was initially focused on whether the objectives and issues should be prioritized separately. The problem with prioritizing the objectives is that the strategic issues contained within each objective have differing priorities. The group subsequently decided to prioritize the 13 strategic issues into three categories (high priority, moderate priority and low priority). Each member was allowed to apply one vote for each for their 5 highest priority issues. High priority issues received 6 or more total votes, moderate

priority 2 to 5 votes, and low priority one or less votes. The voting resulted in the following prioritization of strategic issues:

*High Priority:*

- More rural license and sealing vendors
- Nuisance/distressed wildlife specialists
- Public Service Specialists
- DWC webmaster position

*Moderate Priority:*

- Improved Advisory Committee support
- More communications in rural Alaska
- Improved land status information
- Tell 'em what we know
- Expanded office hours
- Increase staff commitment for public service

*Low Priority:*

- Interactive kiosks
- More shooting ranges
- More media messages

Doug led the group in a discussion of considerations that were used by members when voting on prioritizing the strategic issues. The DMT representatives agreed that this discussion would be helpful to the DMT when the various work group recommendations are discussed. The following were listed by members as factors considered when evaluating prioritization of the strategic issues: administrative feasibility, cost effectiveness, staff availability, regional considerations, potential impact in rural Alaska, potential improvement of understanding problems by the public, benefit to entire state, technological feasibility, potential of addressing perceived staff and/or public frustrations, enhance ability to provide core services, potential to change attitudes of staff towards public.

## **Staffing Recommendations**

The group was asked to summarize its staffing recommendations. The discussion centered around whether we or the infrastructure work group should develop an organization chart and recommend staffing. The group was reminded that the infrastructure group's charge was primarily administrative, and the PSWG still needs to recommend what additional staff would be necessary. The staffing recommendations summarized below were explained more fully in previous meeting summaries and memos, and will be included in the final report to the DMT. The group decided that staffing recommendations should be included under each strategic issue, but not summarized in a separate section of the final report.

Public Service Specialists: One statewide coordinator; regional coordinators; one specialist per area office as needed (more for heavily visited offices along the road system)

License vendor coordinators: Regional coordinators (AC III) to oversee regional programs; statewide coordinator (if needed)

Nuisance wildlife specialists: Refer to January 31 CARA funding memo to Wayne

Miscellaneous: One statewide webmaster (AP III), regional webmasters (as needed); one statewide publication specialist to handle kiosks, websites, handouts, brochures; one statewide publication specialist to develop, update, and coordinate production of publications and videos; shooting range staff (as necessary)

The group decided that development of a detailed organizational chart was premature pending the receipt of public opinion results. The group also recommended that the positions be hired initially at the area office level; hiring the statewide coordinators would have the lowest priority (i.e., start at the field level and work up).

## External Sources of Public Input

The group discussed what segments of the public should be surveyed for input. At a minimum, the list should include the following entities: advisory committee members, hunting/trapping license holders, registered voters, native corporation representatives, disabled citizens, senior citizens, conservation organization representatives, anti-hunting representatives, tourism interests, nonresidents, organized hunting group members, military, organized shooting sport members, rural interests. The sample should also include a proper mix of minorities, males and females, and urban and rural residents.

## Final Report to DMT

Doug led a discussion of how the final report should be written and the timelines that would need to be adhered to. He suggested that we begin the discussion with an outline that was developed by the education work group. After substantive discussion, the following organizational structure of the report was developed:

- I. Executive Summary
- II. Introduction (Included would be a list of group members, their functional title and area of responsibility)
- III. Vision, Mission, Goals, Definitions
- IV. Objectives and Strategic Issues (The list of issues would be abbreviated and would be explained more fully in the next section)
- V. Priority of Strategic Issues (Issues and prioritization into 3 levels would be fully explained)
- VI. Additional Considerations (Included would be a discussion of the need for regional autonomy and statewide consistency; bottom-up hiring of new staff; other issues as identified in the meeting summaries)
- VII. Public Input Recommendations (Included would be a list of potential publics to be surveyed; reasons why development of detailed organizational charts should be delayed; explanation of why public input has been delayed)
- VIII. Appendices (Charter from DMT, various lists generated, meeting summaries, issues flagged as "gifts" to other work groups)

The group decided that the drafters of the report would be Bruce Bartley and Steve Machida. Jeff Selinger and Enid Keyes volunteered to help pull together Sections VI and VIII, respectively. Because all the work group reports need to be completed by August 1, the group set a final completion date of June 15. Potential members who could present the report to the DMT are Kalin and one of the co-chairs. The following schedule of deadlines was developed:

	<u>Deadline Date</u>	<u>Completed by:</u>
a) First draft to members	May 18	co-chairs
b) Feedback to writers	May 25	group members
c) Revised draft to members	June 1	co-chairs
d) Feedback to writers	June 8	group members
e) Final report to members	June 12	co-chairs
f) Final report to DMT	June 15	co-chairs

Doug asked the group to spend some time discussing whether a week-long retreat or holding separate meetings over a number of months would result in a better product. Most of the other work groups have not met, and the time frame available for producing a product is very compressed. The retreat would certainly be more efficient, but may not allow for sufficient staff input. Development of fatigue could certainly become a problem during a prolonged meeting. Allocation of time for rest and staff input would certainly need to be a priority if the retreat method was used for the other work groups.

The meeting of the PSWG was completed by 12 noon, April 19.

## C. LISTS

Contained in this appendix are two lists generated at the PSWG's first meeting. The first is a list of existing programs/services. The second contains ideas generated by PSWG members, staff and members of the public PSWG members had consulted.

### CURRENT

- Allocate permits
- Issue permits
- Issue harvest tickets
- Accept hunt reports
- Provide harvest data, bear ages, hunter demographics, etc. to outside agencies (FWP, WAFWA, USFWS, etc.) and to the public upon request
- Provide databases for staff to look up permit winners, Tier II scores, etc.
- Provide applicant and permit winners' lists to industry vendors (guides, sporting goods vendors, etc.)
- Provide hunt info to AB's, Dept. Public Safety, guides, advisory committees
- Accept, screen, and follow up on nuisance/distressed animal calls from the public
- Provide information on areas to hunt and hunt area boundaries
- Provide information on wildlife population status, density, etc.
- Print and distribute hunting, trapping, and miscellaneous regulations books
- Print and distribute Tier I, Registration, and Drawing permit hunt supplements
- Explain regulatory procedures
- Interpret regulations
- Explain BOG procedures and rationales for BOG decisions
- Assist public with BOG proposal preparation
- Sell hunting licenses, big game tags, fishing licenses, king salmon tags, videos
- Provide first level complaint resolution to the public
- Distribute printed info to the public/vendors
- Provide informational handouts to the public regarding hunting, trapping, and wildlife viewing skills, natural history of Alaska's wildlife, principles of wildlife management, preparation of wildlife for food; field safety, skinning techniques and meat handling, diseases of wildlife, firearms suitability and ballistics, hunting ethics, wildlife viewing locations, bear safety, moose safety, wilderness first aid, careers in wildlife biology , and others. 70+ total
- Provide and maintain DWC Internet web site
- Provide assistance to public callers with DWC's web site
- Provide on-site viewing of informational videos
- Provide verbal information to the public/vendors
- Prepare and provide hunt area maps
- Answer questions from public on wide variety of topics
- Seal, measure, collect specimens as required
- Determine sex and age of specimens as required
- Issue citations
- Provide mandatory orientations for hunters (e.g., court-ordered)
- 1<sup>st</sup> level triage on nuisance and injured animals, on site as required
- Provide info on variety of land subjects, GMU's, private and federal land, trails, snow conditions, firearms restrictions, trails, access restrictions
- Provide info on sport fish/comm. fish/habitat (esp. in rural areas) on limited entry permits; native and federal land restrictions
- Support to license vendors, fur sealers, black bear sealers
- Public announcements on regulatory changes and E.O.'s
- Newspaper articles and radio spots for public announcements
- Classroom presentations

Support of Federal Regional Advisory Councils  
 Help develop stakeholder working groups  
 Issue statewide scientific, educational, and public safety permits  
 Issue proxy hunting permits  
 Provide bear safety programs and presentations  
 Prepare skins and hides for public auction  
 Prepare maps for agencies and individuals  
 Act as clearinghouse forwarding calls to appropriate agencies and individuals at public request  
 Provide and maintain specimen loan collection for schools and individuals  
 Provide CITES exemption forms  
 Assist people in and out of state with harvested wildlife  
 Provide mandatory and voluntary basic Hunter Ed classes  
 Author, publish, distribute Hunter Ed materials  
 Conduct required muzzle loader certification classes  
 Conduct required bow hunter certification classes  
 Recruit, manage, evaluate volunteer instructor corps for Hunter Education  
 Obtain, maintain, and distribute materials for Hunter Ed classes (firearms, ammo, aids)  
 Maintain database of all current and past certified hunters  
 Provide replacement cards to hunters for lost Hunter Ed cards  
 Provide validation to other states for Hunter Education certified persons  
 Validate other states' Hunter Ed certification cards for reciprocity in AK  
 Conduct hunter clinics in 15+ topics around the state  
 Operate and maintain a mobile shooting sports education system  
 Recruit, maintain cooperative working relationships with the sporting industry  
 Maintain cooperative working relationships with hunting groups and other organizations who provide volunteers and monetary support to ADFG Hunter Ed programs  
 Operate and maintain rifle ranges in Anchorage and Fairbanks  
 Publish and distribute the Alaska Hunting Bulletin  
 Author, publish and provide for distribution "Hunt Alaska"  
 Produce, distribute, sell educational hunting videos  
 Conduct programs for youth and women designed for exposure to consumptive use of wildlife  
 BOW program  
 Conduct Fish and Game Day activities  
 Provide internship opportunities  
 Accommodate school Career Days  
 Provide interpretive programs and talks such as at Creamers Field in Fairbanks  
 Actively enhance habitat for wildlife  
 Participate in State and Federal public planning processes  
 Manage refuges

## POTENTIAL NEW OR EXPANDED PUBLIC SERVICES

Automated/electronic one-stop shopping for information and services  
 Outreach to non-hunting public  
 Public Service technician support full-time  
 Inch-to-mile maps displaying privately owned land  
 Larger facility, more parking in Anchorage to accommodate better public service (flag to facilities work group)  
 Traveling public outreach  
 New position, wildlife extension agent for nuisance animals, public information and wildlife education, in each area office (flag to education work group)  
 Visitor centers on highway system (Kenai, Mat-Su, Tok) (flag to facilities work group)  
 Interactive kiosks  
 Resuscitate ADF&G magazine  
 Program to routinely evaluate our public service  
 Electronic library for all DWC publications

Increased use of Internet for public service  
 Increased GIS capacity/capability  
 More aggressive enforcement, field presence by DWC staff during hunting season  
 Reinvigorate advisory committee system, more money, more staff, more diversity  
 Web master position  
 Culturally appropriate hunter ed and firearms safety  
 Local hires in remote areas like the feds' RIT (resource information technician)  
 Mobile sealing unit on weekends  
 Permits readily available statewide for all hunts  
 Aggressively pursue public/private partnerships in providing public service  
 PFD mailouts on safety (hunting, boating, snowmachines etc.)  
 More commercials, PSAs  
 Education extension agents to improve our ability to have a presence in the schools (flag to education work group)  
 DWC liaison between state, feds and natives  
 Simplify regs, present in clearest, most understandable way  
 Tie info centers to refuges similar to Creamer's, particularly at Palmer, Soldotna  
 Develop model for an area office, starting with building design, specifically aimed at public service (flag to facilities work group)  
 Address ways of "living with wildlife"  
 All information multi-lingual and ADA accessible  
 Annual mailouts to hunters with all forms filled out except hunt choices  
 Permanent hunter ID number  
 Increased presence/availability of guest lecturers to UA campus system  
 New spike-fork/50 video specific to Southeast moose  
 Better coordination between regional offices for passing on important hunt information  
 More researchers involved in public service  
 Articles for all research projects in popular press  
 Develop camps designed to teach people about wildlife biology  
 Strategic approach to media outreach  
 PR staff to get info to public  
 Marketing survey strategy similar to Wyoming  
 Adequate staffing in every office  
 Stress public service is part of everyone's job  
 Fur sealer, license vendor in every community  
 More trapper education (flag to education group)  
 Hire specialists to staff info centers; "customer service specialists" as professional about public service as we are about research or management  
 More interchange, exchange visits with other states with respect to public service  
 More strategic involvement with tourism marketing re: wildlife  
 DWC presence on state ferry system  
 Expanded teaching kits on biology, non-game, etc. to distribute to schools, teachers  
 More FWP training on wildlife management and public service  
 Get rid of proxy hunting system  
 Mentoring/inter programs for fledgling biologists  
 Roadside wildlife attractions publication  
 Statewide data base access (intrAnet) re: proxy, bear baiting  
 Revamp Tier II  
 More public awareness of advisory committee and Board of Game processes  
 Field guide to Alaska wildlife diseases  
 Hunting outreach to youth (flag to HIT/education group)

